



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## MARCH MEETING, 1897.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 11th instant, at three o'clock, P. M.; the First Vice-President, JUSTIN WINSOR, LL.D., in the chair.

After the reading of the record of the last meeting and the list of donors to the Library, the Vice-President announced as a committee to nominate officers to be voted for at the Annual Meeting, Messrs. Arthur Lord, James F. Rhodes, and Francis C. Lowell; and as a committee to examine the Treasurer's accounts, Messrs. A. Lawrence Lowell and T. Jefferson Coolidge. He said that as considerable progress had been made in the removal of the Library and Cabinet, it had not been thought desirable to appoint a committee to examine those departments.

The Treasurer said he had made arrangements to execute and deliver the mortgage and deed of the Tremont Street estate in accordance with the votes passed at the last meeting of the Society, and also to pay off the mortgage on the Fenway estate, and that he should defer to a later period any recommendation with regard to the disposition of the remainder of the purchase money to be received by the Society.

The Vice-President briefly announced the death of Mr. George O. Shattuck, a Resident Member, who died on the 23d of February, and called on Mr. James B. Thayer to speak of his friend and former law-partner. MR. THAYER said:—

Mr. Shattuck was elected a Resident Member of this Society on June 13, 1889. Probably he was not chosen with any expectation that he would be able, during his busy years of practice, to attend the meetings of the Society often, or to contribute papers to its proceedings. If any such hopes existed, they have been disappointed. He brought to us, however, the support of a wise and able adviser; and if his life had been spared, he would probably, as he came gradually to withdraw from the pressure of his work, have been seen here oftener, and have come to take a more active part. He was appointed

to write the memoir of our associate William G. Russell, but had not finished it at the time of his own death.

Mr. Shattuck was born in Andover, Massachusetts, May 2, 1829. His ancestors on both sides, coming from England in the first half of the seventeenth century, belonged to the best class of New England people, were marked by strong intelligence and character, and had qualities of courage and devotion which showed themselves by the early appearance in our Revolutionary Army of both his grandfathers. His great-grandfather, Samuel Bailey, Junior, was killed at the battle of Bunker Hill, where he is said to have served as a lieutenant. Mr. Shattuck's father, Joseph Shattuck, represented the town of Andover in the Legislature. After graduating at Phillips Andover Academy, Mr. Shattuck entered Harvard College in 1847 and graduated in 1851. I first knew him in college, but only slightly. He was a leading man there, both in scholarship and character. After leaving college he taught for a time in the school of Stephen M. Weld at Jamaica Plain, and in 1852 entered the Harvard Law School, where he graduated two years later. Here again he held a high place, and gave promise of a distinguished career. After leaving the Law School he studied for a time in the office of Charles G. Loring, was admitted to the bar in 1855, and at once began business in Boston, at No. 40 State Street, in partnership with J. Randolph Coolidge, who had been his classmate at the Law School. In 1856 he accepted an invitation from Peleg W. Chandler to become his partner, at No. 4 Court Street, and was at once thrown, for the rest of his life, into a professional career of great activity. I was admitted as a third member of this firm in 1865. In 1870 Mr. Shattuck withdrew from the firm and became the head of another partnership which included at one time O. W. Holmes, Jr., — until his appointment to the bench in 1882, — and always included William A. Munroe, the partner who survives Mr. Shattuck. Both of these gentlemen had been his students at the old office.

From the very beginning Mr. Shattuck has always been a successful man, and, among his contemporaries, a leader; and no one ever doubted that his success and his distinction were deserved. All through his life he won what he got by the strong, direct, vigorous efforts of a man who felt himself competent for his task and who had thoroughly prepared

himself for it; in the thick of the struggle he saw what he foresaw. He was a man unused to defeat, and little disposed to tolerate it when it seemed to be thrusting itself upon him. His adversaries often found that he developed at such moments a startling capacity of saving a hopeless cause, by the skill, the careful thinking, the knowledge of law and legal procedure, and the endless persistence and endurance which he would suddenly bring to bear upon the situation.

If I say of Mr. Shattuck that he was a learned lawyer, I do not mean learned in the sense of being what is called a legal scholar, or one who is given to the study of law apart from the requirements of his own cases and his own practice. But, nevertheless, he was learned and accomplished. A good foundation had been laid in the studies of his early life as a law student, and he had so scrutinized, digested, and reflected upon the subjects brought before him from time to time in his long professional life, that this large experience had been transmuted into an extensive and ordered body of learning. The estimation in which he was held as a lawyer is sufficiently indicated when it is recalled that he had declined the offers of a position upon the bench of one of the Federal courts in Massachusetts, and also upon that of the Supreme Court of this State; and that he was chosen last year the President of the Bar Association of Boston.

For a short time, early in his professional life, Mr. Shattuck was a member of the Common Council of the City of Boston; with that exception he did not hold public office. But as a citizen he was actively interested in politics, and a cordial supporter of the general policy of the Republican party.

His religious opinions were those of the Unitarians. For many years he was one of the Directors of the American Unitarian Association, and a member of the Prudential Committee of the First Church in Boston. He had long been one of the Overseers of Harvard University, and a trusted friend and adviser of President Eliot.

In 1857 he married Miss Emily Copeland, of Roxbury; and she, with their one child, — a daughter, now the wife of Dr. Arthur T. Cabot, — survives him. Mr. Shattuck had acquired a comfortable fortune; and in recent years, when he had begun to feel the need of rest, he went upon repeated trips to Europe, and to Mexico and the coast of California.

Outside of his profession Mr. Shattuck was a thoughtful man, of large views, and well acquainted with many subjects not connected with the law; so that his conversation was instructive and interesting. While he was always a gentleman, friendly and courteous, he did not devote himself to the smaller *arts* of social intercourse. He was often absorbed and preoccupied with what crowded upon his own mind, and likely at such times rather to take possession of the field of conversation than to invite out his friend into the open. He was a man plain and solid, rather than brilliant; but always he was full of intelligence, large-natured, tender-hearted, and of an engaging simplicity of character. Especially he had a capacity for cordial personal relations, and an incapacity to hide anything from his friends, even if he tried.

One who knew him intimately writes to me, happily and truly, of "his great interest in children, in young people and in young men just starting in life; his enthusiastic admiration, which never grew cold, for the men and women, and even the places, which had once engaged his affection; and that large nature to which things appealed by their magnitude, and which demanded for playthings nothing less than a farm, a woodland, or a boat in which to sail miles away." He dearly loved all country sights and sounds, and had long passed his summers upon his beautiful farm on the bay at Mattapoisett.

I have said little, directly, of my own personal acquaintance with Mr. Shattuck. It began in college and in college societies, nearly fifty years ago; I was in the class next below him. But it was not till some three or four years later that I began to know him well. As a fellow member of a social club of our contemporaries and nearer friends, as his partner in business for several years, and, in course of time, as a friend admitted to intimate relations, I am able to say of him that he was one of the best, kindest, and most devoted friends, one of the most faithful and trustworthy legal advisers, one of the most competent, thoroughly prepared advocates, one of the best citizens, and one of the most faithful, strong, and upright men I have ever known.

Mr. Charles F. Dunbar was appointed to write a memoir of Mr. Shattuck for publication in the Proceedings, and Mr.

Winslow Warren a memoir of the late William G. Russell, which had been previously assigned to Mr. Shattuck.

The CORRESPONDING SECRETARY then read the following letter which he had received from the President, now absent in Europe:—

HOTEL DE LONDRES, ROME, February 4, 1897.

MY DEAR PROFESSOR HAYNES, — During a brief visit to Rome, now drawing to a close, I have been much interested in a possible line of historical investigation, which peculiarly concerns our Society as the holder of the Francis Parkman collection of papers relating to the earlier explorations and the French development in America. I have never examined this collection, but my impression is that the material in it was drawn almost wholly from French archives and other French sources. Meanwhile it is, of course, matter of common knowledge that during the first two centuries and a half of American history — that is, from the discovery by Columbus down to the end of French rule in Canada — the Roman Catholic Church, through its monastic orders and its system of propaganda, was a most active factor in the course of events. Its emissaries were not only ubiquitous, but they were trained and were present with an object, — to observe and report. They were, in fact, — Jesuits, Franciscans, and Dominicans, — the nearest approach then existing to the modern newspaper correspondent. The reports the members of these several Orders made to their superiors were often, and perhaps most frequently, oral, on their return from their missions; but, on the other hand, many such reports were doubtless made from time to time, and in writing, and these would naturally form parts of the archives of the Propaganda or of the several Orders. It would seem, therefore, not unfair to assume that, wholly apart from the well-known collections in the Vatican, and in the public repositories of Naples, Florence, Parma, Venice, etc., which have comparatively slight bearing on American affairs, a valuable body of historical material relating more particularly to America may exist in Rome, where were the headquarters of the Propaganda, of the Jesuits, and other of the missionary organizations.

As the result of tolerably careful inquiry made in the best informed quarters here, I cannot find that this possible field has been searched. Neither Parkman nor Prescott could have worked into it, for in their time it was still a closed book. It is not necessary for my present purpose to more than allude to the well-known examinations being made into the vast collection known as the Archives of the Vatican. There is, in the October number of the "American Historical Review" (vol. ii. no. 1, pp. 40-58), a highly interesting paper by Charles H. Haskins, to which I will refer those of the Society who may desire

to be informed on this, historically, most important topic. I am told by those here most competent to speak on the subject, that the Haskins paper shows a very complete mastery of the facts as they now exist. From it any one desirous of learning what has been done by the various governments towards supplementing their own records from this source can get the necessary information. Meanwhile, I shall quote, in order to make it of record in the Proceedings of the Society, what Mr. Haskins has to say on this point so far as American history is concerned. It is contained in the closing paragraph of his paper:—

“The value and extent of the Roman sources for American history would appear only after a prolonged examination. Unquestionably, the general history of the Western world, even of those parts which have always been predominantly Catholic, stands in no such close relation to the papal system as does the history of Europe, and it were vain to expect the same assistance from Roman archives in the one field as in the other. Nevertheless, there is every reason to believe that the Vatican collections contain much of special interest to American students, particularly in regard to the age of exploration and colonization, and the history of Latin America, — in which directions the material is doubtless most abundant, while our opportunity is at the same time the wider, owing to the backwardness of Spain and Portugal in undertaking researches at the Vatican. A systematic and thorough investigation of the American material at the Vatican ought certainly to be made, — either by a specially qualified agent, or, better still, by an American School of Historical Studies at Rome. It is not the place here to insist upon the utility of such a school, established upon the general plan of the classical schools at Rome and Athens, and working in friendly co-operation with them and with the historical institutes already founded by European countries. If it were properly organized and directed, I believe a school at Rome would prove of the greatest value, not only by its actual contributions to historical knowledge, but also by its stimulating effect upon the serious study of history among us. Its activities should not be confined to American subjects, but should also include some of the numerous other problems of general interest whose solution lies in the archives and libraries of Rome and other parts of Italy, so that the idea of such an institution ought to appeal to all who are concerned in the progress of historical science in America, regardless of the directions in which their own special studies may lie.”

It will be observed that in the foregoing extract from his paper Mr. Haskins speaks only of the Vatican collections and the researches up to this time therein made. My own impression, however, is that, so far as American history is concerned, the Vatican archives would not prove the most profitable field for investigation. I am confirmed in this impression by Mr. William Bliss, who has for years been conducting investigations here as agent of the British Public Record Office, and whose experience has probably been as extensive and varied as that of

any person ever engaged in work of that character, at least in Rome. I am indebted to him for some suggestions, as well as most of the little information I possess on the subject.

So far as the purposes of this letter are concerned, the following, I am informed, are the general facts in the case. There is in Italy, and especially in Rome, a vast but scattered accumulation of archives, and of documents of more or less historical value;—these are in public and private repositories in various cities and residences, while those of an ecclesiastical character are, or were, more especially at Rome, some in the Vatican, some in the Propaganda, and some in the hands of the several monastic Orders. These several accumulations have from time to time been injured by transfers of possession, as well as by direct spoliation and processes of removal. For instance, the first Napoleon caused large bodies of papers to be carried to Paris, and many documents of value are believed to have disappeared at that time. Wellnigh innumerable other documents have from time to time, from lack of proper care in their custody, been stolen, or carelessly taken. But, so far as my present purpose is concerned, the most disastrous event of all was probably what occurred in connection with the Sardinian occupation of Rome on the eventful 20th of September, 1870. When, on that day, Victor Emmanuel entered Rome, the so-called Cancelleria and the Propaganda, as well as the Church of St. Peter's and the Vatican, were, in accordance with the fixed policy of the Kingdom of Italy, left undisturbed in the hands of the Pope as necessary adjuncts of his Spiritual Dominion. This secured two of the great bodies of archives—that of the Vatican and that of the Propaganda—from injury by interference. But the same immunity was not extended to the other bodies of archives,—and those in which we, as Americans, are probably more immediately interested,—I refer to the archives of the monastic and missionary Orders,—the Franciscans, the Dominicans, and the Jesuits. On the contrary, by a decree issued shortly after the 20th of September, the name and exact date of which are not essential to my present purpose, the archives and papers of these Orders were declared public, or royal, property, and ordered to be seized; and Baedeker says (*Central Italy and Rome*, 12th ed. 1897, pp. 130, 131) that, the present *Biblioteca Centrale Vittorio Emanuele* “(500,000 volumes, and several thousand MSS.) was formed in 1871 from the library of the Jesuits and suppressed convents.” Meanwhile there is reason to suppose that what was naturally to be expected in process of this transfer then took place. In anticipation of forcible dispossession, the archives were broken up, and, to a large extent, removed. The present whereabouts of the papers thus removed is certainly not matter of general information, and I cannot find that, if they still exist, they have ever been examined with a view to their bearing on American



history; the portion not removed, and which passed into the hands of the government, is now in the Library Victor Emmanuel, and in the Archivio di Stato, in the Vicolo Valdina at Rome, and has been more or less examined.

I have also seen Professor Lanciani, who, in addition to his well-known researches into the antiquities of Rome, has incidentally in his examination of the archives and private collections come upon much relating to America. Professor Lanciani confirms the above statements in all essential respects, and he is under an impression that the necessary preliminary examination could be made in a comparatively short time. Professor Lanciani also referred specifically to a valuable diplomatic correspondence in relation to the discovery of America, traces of which existed in the Vatican, though the original papers may have disappeared wholly or in part at the time of the sack of Rome by the army of the Constable of Bourbon in 1527. On one quite important point the indications given by Professor Lanciani differ from those I had derived from Mr. Bliss. While speaking in the strongest terms of his belief in the extent of the information which might reasonably be hoped for from the several sources here, — even going so far as to say that he thought considerable portions of American history might need to be re-written in the light of the new discoveries, — while, I say, going even to this extent, Professor Lanciani did not think that the correspondence of the several missionary Orders — Dominicans, Franciscans, and Jesuits — had been seized by the State under the decree of 1870, or would now be found in the Public Archives. That decree, he told me, related merely to muni-ments of title and matters of official record, and not to private or ecclesiastical papers. These last, which would include the papers of American historical interest, were left undisturbed in the hands of the Orders, and should there be looked for. This material, as well as that in the possession of the Propaganda, is very large; but to what degree it has been examined I am not advised, nor does Professor Lanciani, or any one else that I have yet heard of, know in how far, if at all, it bears upon American history, or, indeed, where it is.

As to access to the material referred to, and the necessary facilities for examining it, neither Mr. Bliss nor Professor Lanciani thought the difficulties insuperable, provided only the work were approached in a true historic spirit. The Propaganda might prove the most difficult. But even in the case of the Propaganda, if the authorities in charge were satisfied that the researches proposed would be confined to the discovery of historical data relating to a more or less remote past, suspicions might be allayed. As to the several missionary Orders, Professor Lanciani, with great kindness, offered to institute private inquiries among his friends, which not improbably might indicate where

the desired records may now be preserved, whether in Italy, in France, or in Spain. I hope to hear further from him on the subject at no remote day. He also expressed the opinion that the necessary researches could best be conducted in the way suggested by Mr. Haskins, in the extract I have quoted from his paper, — that is, in connection with a well and efficiently organized American School in Rome. This Professor Lanciani informed me was no new idea of his; he had, in fact, long since put himself formally on record to that effect. It is unnecessary to point out that any Society interesting itself in this research could act most effectively through the agency of such a School.

Meanwhile, it may not be inexpedient for me, in view of the very thorough investigations which have of late been carried on in Italy, to emphasize the fact that, in the particular field to which I have in this letter confined myself, — the field of the Propaganda, so far as its accumulations of material may relate to America, and the private archives of the missionary Orders under the same limitations, — in this particular and somewhat narrowed field, almost everything is surmise. It is well known that a vast mass of historical material exists, either very partially or not at all as yet examined, and some of it unquestionably relates to America, though how much, or in what degree, no one can yet say; while, of course, it is matter of common knowledge, that the Church of Rome, both directly and through its various Orders, the headquarters of which were here, interested itself deeply and actively in the early development of the continents discovered by Columbus. It is needless to add that any finds from this source would be in the direct line of the investigations heretofore made by Prescott and Parkman, and complementary thereto; while, on the other hand, the propriety of more systematic investigations being initiated and conducted by the Society which is the custodian of the Parkman papers is, did circumstances permit, apparent. A great field of activity and usefulness would be opened to it.

It only remains to speak of the scope and extent of any examination which might be begun, and its approximate cost. Obviously it would be quite useless — in fact, a mere waste of time and money — to enter upon such an examination as that proposed unless sufficient means were provided to carry it on when once begun, systematically and comprehensively, and to a definite conclusion. It would be necessary to find, at any rate in part, where documents are, before learning what they may contain. A wide field is to be explored, and an incredible amount of papers examined. Under such circumstances any estimate of time and money necessary for the work must be unreliable; but, the best judgment I have been able to arrive at, after consulting those whose examinations in other directions in the same field render their opinions

of value, is that some five years of time and an expenditure of \$10,000 might suffice for the preliminary work. It would then be possible to judge what, if anything, should further be done. The sum is considerable,—almost, indeed, the quarter of one per cent of the cost of a modern battle-ship,—and yet, from what I have here seen and learned, I am tempted to express the belief that even this sum, thus expended, would, in the course of another century, be looked upon as spent not less profitably than the much larger amount required in the construction of what is known as a “commerce destroyer”; especially if the former, and lesser, amount should, as may not unreasonably be hoped, lead to unearthing what perchance might prove to be a buried Pompeii of historical lore. The comparison is suggestive; and, indeed, it is difficult to avoid a tendency to a slight touch of cynicism when one contrasts the lavish expenditure on armaments and war material apparent everywhere, with the severe and even cheese-paring economies observed as respects investigations of the utmost historical import. The government of the United States, for instance, in common with those of Spain and Portugal, has, from motives of economy, no agent or representative of a Public Record Office at work to-day in the archives of Italy.

Believe me, etc.,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

HENRY W. HAYNES, Esq.,  
Corresponding Secretary, etc.

The reading of the letter elicited interesting remarks from the FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT, and from Messrs. WILLIAM R. THAYER, MORTON DEXTER, and EDWARD G. PORTER.

Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN presented, in behalf of Mr. Charles H. Hart, of Philadelphia, a Corresponding Member, a copy of the Everett medal, and read an extract from Mr. Hart's letter to himself, as follows:—

“As you say the Historical Society has not a copy of the Edward Everett medal, I take pleasure in sending a proof for its acceptance. It was one of the first struck for the engraver, Anthony Conrad Paquet, before he delivered the dies, and he presented it to me as the best head he had engraved. Mr. Paquet was born in Hamburg of French parentage, December 5, 1814. He was probably the most skilful medalist we have had in this country, whither he came in October, 1848, and settled in Philadelphia. Nine years later he became assistant engraver in the United States Mint, a position he held until 1864. His ability as a designer and die-sinker is generally recognized and fully exhibited by the delicate modelling and fine relief of this Everett medal. He was the designer and engraver of the well-known Mint Cabinet medal, which

bears on the obverse a beautifully executed profile of Washington, after the Houdon bust. He also engraved the Buchanan, Lincoln and Grant, Indian Peace medals, as they are called. Mr. Paquet, who was very diminutive in his physique, died in Washington, D. C., where for three years he had been employed in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, September 5, 1882. Besides the medals mentioned, he engraved the dies for the national coinage of Chile and Bolivia.

MR. WILLIAM S. APPLETON read the following paper: —

*The Whigs of Massachusetts.*

I have undertaken, with some hesitation, to put together a few thoughts on the subject of the Whigs of Massachusetts, particularly in the years between 1840 and 1850; and I take as a sort of text some words from a letter of Nathan Appleton to Charles Sumner, dated 4 September, 1848: "I have regretted your course the last two years. But more in sorrow than in anger." I may be considered to labor under a disadvantage in having been only a boy even at the later date, 1850. But there are circumstances which perhaps go far to offset this disadvantage, in personal and family relations. My father, Nathan Appleton, was at this time one of the leaders among the older Whigs in the State, whose words were heard with attention, and whose counsels were received with respect. Robert C. Winthrop was a friend of my father, perhaps as intimate as is ever the case where a difference of thirty years exists, and Winthrop's second wife was a dearly loved own cousin of my mother. I remember being often at their house in Pemberton Square, and feeling perfectly at home there; and Mr. Winthrop's name still lingers in my memory with the familiar title of Colonel, derived from his service on the staff of Governor Everett. The father of Charles Sumner was, except in the eye of the law and the genealogist, also an own cousin of my mother; and the irregularity of his birth was as completely ignored by all the Sumner family as if it never existed. Charles Sumner was, till 1846, a most welcome and beloved guest in my father's house, though of his presence there I am sorry to say I have no definite recollection.

These facts are my reason and my excuse for venturing to offer some views on the Whigs of my boyhood, especially as to their personal relations. Mr. Pierce has drawn, with great skill and fairness, the sad picture of the breaking of social ties,

but it did not come within the scope of his work to consider the hearts of those from whom Sumner separated himself. He voluntarily caused the separation, from motives which I have no thought of questioning or criticising. They are undoubtedly considered to do him honor. But it was not in human nature, as we know it, for those whom he left to have acted otherwise than as they did, and I presume that no one blames them for having resented Sumner's acts and words.

The Whig party existed under that name for a little less than the quarter century between 1830 and 1855. It was successful in only two presidential elections, — 1840 and 1848; and the former of these, seemingly a triumph, was the barrenest sort of victory. The laurels turned to the bitterest ashes. It only had complete control of the national government, President, Senate, and House of Representatives, for the month's presidency of William Henry Harrison. During the next twenty-three months its nominal rule was of the most uncertain kind, and never after did it hold more than two of the three co-ordinate branches of the American Parliament. It was strong in several States, among which Massachusetts stood high, — one of the faithful four which voted against Pierce in 1852. In 1840 it was at first hopeful of victory, and then flushed with the victory it had won.

At that time among the older Whigs, leaders of the party, more particularly in Eastern Massachusetts, were Webster, Davis, Lincoln, Gorham, Lawrence, Everett, and my father, few of whom, if any, were really old men. Adams, Winthrop, Hillard, Curtis, Sumner, and Motley were the leaders of a group of young men, to whom the elders looked for their successors, who should perpetuate all that was good and honorable in the record of the party, and who should carry it on to greater good and higher honor in the future. In the case of the three men of whom I first spoke, Nathan Appleton on one side, Winthrop and Sumner on the other, a stronger feeling existed, and political sympathy and pride were mingled with deep personal admiration and affection. A few years earlier Phillips would have held a place second to none of the younger men. And when Phillips was followed by Adams and Sumner, the older men had reason for anxious thought and grief. The personal separation had come, even if political prospects seemed as yet undimmed; and it is the personal separation which I have most

in mind, and which I wish to emphasize. Sumner might sadly say, "There was a time when I was welcome at almost every house within two miles of us, but now hardly any are open to me." But the occupants of those houses might say with equal or greater sadness, "There was a time when Charles Sumner was gladly welcomed here as guest, but he has left us." It may be that those whose life was less in the future than the past were the more to be pitied.

The Whigs of Massachusetts did not approve of slavery ; on the contrary, many of them had denounced it in the strongest terms, and would gladly have seen its end. But they looked on it as an unavoidable condition of the existence of the Union, which seemed to them worthy of almost every kind of sacrifice. In comparison with its preservation the rights of the black race seemed small indeed, and might be left to the wisdom of a Divine Providence, which should turn the Southern States to a better way.<sup>1</sup>

In such circumstances Charles Sumner announced that he could no longer act with the Whig party, and condemned its leaders and their acts in very strong words. His great abilities and fine qualities were not accompanied by an appreciation of the force of the English language. Small wonder then that Winthrop, his as yet more successful contemporary, broke forth in words of bitter indignation. Small wonder that an older man wrote, "I have regretted your course the last two years. But more in sorrow than in anger." My father felt that their deep friendship and familiar intercourse had come to a full stop. Neither Winthrop nor Appleton were men, had he acted otherwise than as he did. Fortunate were they, to whom political antagonism was as nothing in comparison with other sympathies. Prescott among his books was almost to be envied ; one would say wholly to be envied, but for his sad physical infirmity. He could enjoy equally the friendship of Ticknor on the one hand, and of Sumner on the other. But not to many was such good fortune given.

<sup>1</sup> Nathan Appleton wrote in 1851 : "His [Sumner's] views on the slavery question if adopted by the people of the north will certainly lead to a dissolution of the Union, and nearly as certainly to a civil war & bloodshed, & with great probability to a general massacre of the blacks. . . . So much for slavery & negrodom. I prefer to leave them to the wise God who made them rather than to excite our passions, and perhaps cut our throats, about a matter which so little concerns ourselves."

The Whig party of Massachusetts was rent in twain. Victorious later in 1852 and 1853, these successes were but the last struggles of the dying body. But when it fell, Massachusetts fell a long way with it. Neither the Commonwealth nor the Whigs claimed to be omniscient; but both fell at the blow — shall we say the foul blow? — of a party which lives in history under the name of Know Nothing. Massachusetts rose again; the Whig party could not. With whatever of merit it may claim, with whatever of fault it would gladly disown, its course was run, its record was closed.

But in 1861 where were the survivors of the Whigs of Massachusetts? I think we can understand what their feelings must have been. Grief and astoundment must have contended for the mastery, — grief at the approach of that which they had devoted their lives to avert; astoundment that such madness had seized such numbers, and that their old friends at the South were powerless for good, if not even active for harm. But with, perhaps, no exception the Whigs of Massachusetts were among the most loyal of citizens. The addresses of Everett and Winthrop, on presenting flags respectively to the Twelfth and Twenty-second Regiments of Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, were not surpassed for lofty patriotism. Right by the side of Webster's words, "Not a stripe erased or polluted, nor a single star obscured," we may put, "A Star for every State, and a State for every Star." My father, lying on his bed of death, could do nothing but contribute freely of his abundant means. His cousin William Appleton, — perhaps, except Crittenden, the last Whig in public life, — victorious over Burlingame the previous autumn, at the age of seventy-four resumed his old seat in the House of Representatives at the extra session of July, and without hesitation gave his vote for Galusha A. Grow as Speaker. Devoting all his energies to his work on the Committee of Ways and Means in the heat of a Washington summer, he returned home only to resign his seat, and in a few months to die of simple physical exhaustion, caused by his faithful labors.

I have written these words not by way of vindication of the old Whigs of Massachusetts, for they need no vindication, and I have less than no claim to be their vindicator. But I have long felt that some such statement as I have tried to make ought to be made, and I know not where to find it. It hardly

lay in the province of the biographer of Webster or Lawrence ; still less in that of the biographer of Sumner. There is a suggestion of some such tribute in Dana's Address on the Life and Services of Everett. The Whigs were faithful to their duty as they saw it, and to their country, for they loved it. But few, very few, so far as I know, are the words which have been spoken or written to do them honor. I have tried to do something to this end, without injustice to those who left them. Would that the pleasant duty had fallen into abler hands !

Rev. EDWARD G. PORTER read the following paper : —

*The Morse Tablet at Rome.*

Mr. President, — It is always gratifying to our national pride to know that any of our countrymen of acknowledged distinction are honored in other lands ; and especially is it of interest to us when a son of Massachusetts is thus honored, and, I may add, a son of one of the early members of this Society.

A few months ago, as I was walking through some of the narrow and picturesque streets in Rome, between the Corso and the Ripetta a little to the south of the Piazza Borghese, my attention was arrested by a fine marble tablet attached to a substantial-looking house in the Via dei Prefetti, No. 17.

The inscription ran as follows : —

S. P. Q. R.

QVESTA CASA ABITO

DAL XX FEBRAIO MDCCCXXX

AL V GENNAIO MDCCCXXXI

SAMVELE FINLEY BREESE MORSE

INVENTORE DEL TELEGAFO ELETTRICO MAGNETICO SCRIVENTE

NATO A CHARLESTOWN IL XXVII APRILE MDCCXC

MORTO A NEW YORK IL II APRILE MDCCCLXXXII

MDCCCLXXXIII



The tablet does not say where Charlestown was, not even in what country; but as New York is mentioned it is readily assumed that Charlestown is somewhere in that part of the world.

This unexpected honor bestowed upon Finley Morse is worthy of our notice, showing, as it does, how far-reaching is the fame of a man whose life has been of positive service to mankind. And Italy, which leads all other countries in the practice of erecting memorial tributes to her own eminent citizens, is not unmindful of the fact that she has herself been honored by the presence of illustrious visitors, such as Goethe, Scott, and Morse, each of whom has now a tablet in Rome. These tablets are usually erected by the municipal authorities, and bear the ancient official designation of S. P. Q. R. The Via dei Prefetti is quite near Hilda's Tower, in the Via Portoghese, which every reader of Hawthorne will remember.

In the brilliancy of Morse's later career as an electrician, the world is likely to forget that during the first half of his life he was an artist, and was in Rome at this period to paint a number of pictures for which he had received orders before leaving America. He spent much of his time at the Vatican, copying from Raphael and other masters. Among his friends at Rome that winter were Fenimore Cooper, Theodore Woolsey, Horatio Greenough, Horace Vernet, Thorwaldsen, Gibson, and Wyatt. Morse was much impressed by Thorwaldsen, and painted his portrait for Philip Hone, the New York mayor. That portrait, through the generosity of the late John Taylor Johnston, has since found its way to Denmark, where it is one of the recognized treasures of the royal gallery.

Indeed Morse had achieved a great reputation as an artist. His portraits of President Monroe, Chancellor Kent, Jay, Lafayette, De Witt Clinton, Fitz-Greene Halleck, Bryant, and other persons of note brought him many commissions.

It is interesting to know that Morse's first work, after leaving college, was a somewhat ambitious study of the "Landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth," painted in his father's parsonage on the hill, and forgotten for more than half a century when it was found, with the artist's name on the back of it, amid the rubbish in the attic of the City Hall at Charlestown. It was brought down and hung in the mayor's office, and it

may now be seen on the walls of the Public Library in the same building. The canvas is about  $5\frac{1}{2}$  by  $4\frac{1}{2}$  feet. There are two prominent figures. One, partly enveloped in a cloak, stands apparently in the prow of a small open boat. The other, on the right, is a fine tall figure, with belt, sash, and drawn sword, leather breeches and high topboots, wading in the water. Between them two men are dimly seen in the boat, one of them pointing toward the shore.

It was this picture,<sup>1</sup> crude as it is, and another executed at about the same time, — perhaps “Marius on the Ruins of Carthage,” — that led Stuart and Allston to persuade Morse’s father to send him to England to pursue his art studies. He sailed with Allston in 1811, and worked under his tuition in London four years, sharing a studio with Leslie, and frequently aided by West. Such was the progress of young Morse, that within two years he took the gold medal at the Adelphi for a model of the “Dying Hercules.”

Among his pupils, after he returned from Rome in 1832, was Daniel Huntington, who calls him his “dear master and father in art,” but says that Morse’s studio was already being transformed into a laboratory. Portraits and landscapes still grew upon his easel, but “galvanic batteries and mysterious lines of wire” occupied the larger share of his thoughts, and he seemed “like an alchemist of the middle ages in search of the philosopher’s stone.”

In view of the marvellous success that finally crowned Professor Morse’s patient efforts in science, I may call your attention to a unique and almost prophetic description of him as an infant by Dr. Belknap, whom it is always safe to quote in this room. In a letter<sup>2</sup> to his friend Hazard, dated Boston, 29th April, 1791, he says: “If the Monmouth Judge is with you, congratulate him on the birth of a grandson . . . Next Sunday he is to be loaded with names, not quite so many as the Spanish ambassador . . . but *only four*; viz., Samuel Finley Breese Morse. They intend to go through the catalogue at once. . . . As to the child, I saw him asleep, so can say nothing of his eye, or his genius peeping through it. He may have the sagacity of a Jewish Rabbi, or the profundity of a Calvin, or the sublimity of a Homer, . . . but time will bring forth all things.”

<sup>1</sup> Prime’s Life of Morse, p. 738.

<sup>2</sup> Belknap Papers, II. 254.

Having spoken of the tablet in Rome, I ought to say that, in addition to the statue in Central Park, there are in our country two marble inscriptions to the memory of this illustrious man. One is placed upon the front of the house in Charlestown in which he was born,<sup>1</sup> a venerable three-story wooden mansion now somewhat dismantled, No. 201 Main Street, a few doors west of Dr. Ellis's Church. The other is seen upon the brownstone four-story house, No. 5 West Twenty-second Street, New York.<sup>2</sup> Here the inventor spent the later years of his life in the enjoyment of his well-earned honors ; and here he died in 1872.

I might add that the Roman municipality has recently honored another of our countrymen in the new quarter by the Tiber, near Monte Testaccio, where a street has been laid out bearing the name Via Benjamino Franklin. And it is in genial company, so far as names are concerned ; for, leading into it, I noticed Via Alessandro Volta and Via Galvani.

Mr. Joseph Williamson, of Belfast, Maine, was elected a Corresponding Member.

<sup>1</sup> In the east rear chamber. A view of this house, as it was before the recent changes, is given in the *Memorial History of Boston*, III. 553.

<sup>2</sup> See *Harper's Weekly*, 1896, No. 7, p. 1101.